

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending.

Claims 8, 9, 13 and 15 were objected to.

Claims 1-7, 10-12 and 14 were rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

The indication that the documents on the Information Disclosure Statement filed have been considered is noted.

Foreign Priority

The indication that the priority papers submitted under 35 USC 119(a) - (d) have been placed in the file is noted.

Drawings

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to. The proposed drawing changes have been submitted. Upon approval, the formal drawings will be submitted within the time period set by the Patent Office.

It will be noted that the printed circuit is being illustrated as an insulating material but it can be formed by other equivalent materials as explained in Reimer (USP 3,670,409) column 3, lines 71-72.)

Reply to Objections

Claim 3 was objected to for the reasons explained on page 3 of the Office Action. Claim 3 has been amended along the lines suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to claim 3.

Reply to Rejections

First Rejection

Claims 1, 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Homfeldt et al. (USP 5,620,290). This rejection in view of the amendment to base claim 1 is traversed.

Claim 1 (amended) now requires that the connection portion is in direct physical contact with a chassis. This is not shown either specifically or inherently in the reference. Accordingly a rejection under 35 USC 102 is not viable.

Although claim 1 has been amended, it also would not be obvious from the reference, especially considering the results obtained which is to improve audio in a vehicle.

Results must be considered in arriving at a conclusion of obviousness.

With respect to dependent claims 2 and 4, these claims are considered patentable at least for the same reasons as base claim 1 as amended.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102.

Second Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Reimer (USP 3,670,409). This rejection is traversed.

As explained in the response to the first rejection, claim 1 has been amended to call for the connection portion being in direct physical contact with a chassis. This is not shown either specifically nor is it inherent from the reference applied.

Even though claim 1 has been amended, it would not be obvious from the reference especially considering the result achieved as explained in the reply to the first rejection.

The dependent claims are considered patentable at least for the same reasons as their base or intervening claims.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102.

Third Rejection

Claims 1, 4, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kotani et al. (USP 5,877,673). This rejection is traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to call for "the connection portion is in direct physical contact with a chassis."

This is not present in the reference, either specifically or inherently. Accordingly, a rejection under 35 USC 102 is not viable.

Even though claim 1 has been amended, there would be no motivating reason to modify the reference to arrive at the claimed invention without benefit of the applicants' disclosure. Also, the results must be considered as explained in the response to the first rejection, *supra*.

The dependent claims are considered patentable at least for the same reasons as their base or intervening claims.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102.

Fourth Rejection

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reimer (USP 3,670,409).

Reimer does not show or suggest the structure in claim 1 amended. This is explained in the reply to the rejection based on Reimer under 35 USC 102 *supra*.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claim under 35 USC 103.

Fifth Rejection

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Homfeldt et al. (USP 5,620,290). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 14 is dependent on amended claim 1. As explained in the reply to the first rejection under 35 USC 102. The reference does not show or suggest what has been claimed in claim 14.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claim under 35 USC 103.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 9, the Examiner indicated that claims 8, 9, 13 and 15 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of their base or intervening claims.

These claims have been rewritten in independent form and are considered patentable in view of the claimed subject matter.

Claim 16 was allowed.

Additional Art

The additional art cited on the PTO Form 892 has been noted, but as this art has not been applied, no comments are considered necessary.

New Claim

New claim 17 has been added. This claim is considered patentable at least for the same reasons as base claim 1.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Elliot Goldberg (Reg. No. 33,347) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
for Charles Gorenstein, #29,271

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

CG/EAG/jm/slb
1131-506PUS1